

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Russia?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, Jr.

Speakers

WALTER H. JUDD

JAMES P. WARBURG

ROBERT MAGIDOFF

H. V. KALTENBORN

(See also page 12)

COMING

— June 7, 1949 —

What Should Be the Limits for Public Free Speech?

— June 14, 1949 —

How Can the Free Peoples of the World Best Share Peace and Well-Being?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 15, NUMBER 5  \$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MAY 31:

"How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Russia?"

Mr. DENNY.....	3
Mr. MAGIDOFF.....	4
Congressman JUDD.....	6
Mr. KALTENBORN.....	8
Mr. WARBURG.....	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!.....	14



THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 7:

"What Should Be the Limits for Public Free Speech?"



THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 14:

"How Can the Free People of the World Best Share Peace and Well-Being?"



The Broadcast-Telecast of May 31, 1949, originated in Town Hall, New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EDT, over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, N. Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



MAY 31, 1949

VOL. 15, No. 5

How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Russia?

Announcer:

Tonight, your Town Meeting begins its fifteenth year on the air. Some of you will remember our first Town Meeting on Memorial Day, in 1935, when we discussed the question, "Which Way, America — Fascism, Communism, Socialism, or Democracy?"

Although the program took place at 10:00 o'clock at night and was broadcast on only a couple of dozen stations, more than 3,000 listeners wrote to express their enthusiasm and appreciation of this new type of program. Since then, our network has grown to embrace all of the 265 stations of the American Broadcasting Company.

Tonight, we salute these station managers from coast to coast who bring this program to you each week as a public service. We take this opportunity to thank them for their warm letters of congratulations and appreciation on our fourteenth birthday.

Also, we want to thank you, our listeners, for your support throughout the years and particularly for your contributions to our Dollars for Democracy campaign to send your Town Meeting around the world.

Now to preside over our discussion, here is our moderator, the President of Town Hall, New York, and founder of America's Town Meeting, George V. Denny, Jr., Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Yes, tonight we begin our fifteenth year on the air. There's no time for celebration as all of us here at Town Hall are working day and night to insure the success of our great adventure in taking your Town Meeting around the world.

Our advance party left last Saturday on a Pan American Clipper, and they're now in London working out the details of our program there. They will then fly to Paris,

Berlin, Vienna, Rome, Ankara, Tel Aviv, Cairo, Karachi, New Delhi, Manila, Tokyo, and Honolulu, making arrangements for the programs you will hear during July, August, and September.

Now why are we doing this? We are doing this to help you, our audience, find the right answers to the all-important question we are discussing tonight: "How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Soviet Russia?"

Some of us don't like the idea of having to deal with this question. Some of us don't realize we're living in the midst of a world revolution, but, my friends, we are. As we saw last week, the present conflict between the communism of Soviet Russia and the western democracies is costing us at least 20 billion dollars a year—20 billion dollars a year. That means that about one-half of every one of your tax dollars is needed to support this conflict.

Must this go on indefinitely, or do we in our lives have the wisdom and courage and resources to put an end to this fantastic and extremely dangerous situation?

Will the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting tonight in Paris be able to resolve their differences with Russia with respect to Germany and Austria? And what of Russia's moves in Asia and the Balkans?

Mr. Magidoff, Congressman Judd, Mr. Kaltenborn, and Mr. Warburg, we have given you a

large assignment tonight, but we need your counsel on this urgent question, and we recognize our responsibility for leadership in this moment of history.

So let's hear first from a man who was suddenly expelled from Russia about a year ago after 12 years there, most of the time as a foreign correspondent. Many of us have read your current book, called *In Anger and Pity*, but this is our first opportunity to hear you on America's Town Meeting.

As a native-born Russian, who came to the United States as a boy and who became an American citizen, attended New York City schools, and graduated from the University of Wisconsin before returning to Russia to do newspaper work and broadcasting, we shall be most interested in your counsel on tonight's question, Mr. Robert Magidoff. Mr. Magidoff. (Applause.)

Mr. Magidoff:

Our differences with Russia, in my opinion, are so fundamental that absolutely nothing can resolve them on a permanent basis. The Communists believe that capitalism is doomed to be replaced by a new social order through a series of socialist revolutions which no capitalist country can escape.

Moreover, the Communists hold that each country which has achieved its revolution must serve as a base for spreading it to other areas.

In the meantime, the remaining capitalist world is viewed by communism not only as an object of further expansion, but also as an enemy who will forever seek to restore capitalism. And the Russians have a word for it. That word is "capitalist encirclement," and its tower of strength is, in the eyes of the Russians, the United States of America.

We, therefore, see in Russia a real and dangerous threat to ourselves, our allies, and to the principles of liberty and democracy upon which our world rests.

One way of resolving our differences with Russia might be a preventive atomic war against the Soviet Union. But democracies simply don't go for such measures. Besides, a preventive atomic war could not eliminate the problem. Such a war would only bring misery so immense that communism would rise in many corners of the world despite the probable total defeat of Russia.

We could make a deal with the Kremlin and divide the world into Soviet and American spheres. The Kremlin would love nothing more. But you know, as well as I do, that the American people would not stand for such a deal, the United States Government would not negotiate it, nor would our friends, the free democracies, agree to it.

Furthermore, such a deal, too, would not work. We would be kept out of Russia's sphere by a curtain of steel and fire, whereas the Communists would seek to

undermine our sphere everywhere and, in the first place, in the United States itself.

The only way out, it seems to me, is to accept Russia's ideological challenge and fight it out in peaceful, even if troubled, competition. To win we have to follow a series of "musts."

Since only American strength stands between Russia and further aggression, we must retain our military superiority and continue our policy of firmness.

We must detect and combat all of Russia's tactics designed to wreck the Marshall Plan which is our most effective weapon in combating the misery and instability that breed communism.

We must reach the people of Russia and its satellites mainly through a strengthened Voice of America. By word and deed, we must convince them that the Kremlin policies, and not we, are their enemies. Moscow tells the Russian people that the U. S. A. is the stumbling block on their way to normalcy and good living. Moscow tells the satellites that they can survive and prosper only by following the Kremlin. Our job is to unmask those two big lies.

We must stand guard over democracy at home and abroad despite the pressures of the cold war, and this particular "must," I admit, poses monumental problems. Is it permissible to intervene, on behalf of democracy, in the internal affairs of a country

that owes its very survival to our intervention? I think it is permissible, in a country like Greece, for example, on behalf of democracy. Firm intervention might have saved China for democracy.

And to get closer home, we must make careful distinction between conspiracy and the exercise of our inalienable rights.

To sum it up, a successful fight for stability, prosperity, and genuine democracy will automatically contain communism, and this will reduce the struggle between the two worlds to peaceful, even if turbulent, competition in which the better man wins, and my bet is on the man of the democratic world. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Magidoff. Whenever our next speaker is announced, whether it be in a small town of the Middle West or in the halls of Congress, he always draws a full house. Congressman Walter Judd was born in a small Nebraska town with a population of less than four hundred. After service in the field artillery in World War I, Walter Judd finished college and went to China as a medical missionary. Incensed by America's indifference to Japan's attack on China, he came home to call the attention of the American people to our danger.

Many of you will remember hearing him on this platform at that time, in 1939. Dr. Judd, what is your opinion on tonight's ques-

tion—"How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Soviet Russia?" Congressman Walter Judd, Republican of Minnesota. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Judd:

I agree wholly with Mr. Magidoff that if to resolve our differences with the Soviet they must become democratic or we become communistic, then there is no hope, indeed. However, our practical task is to try to get agreement on traffic rules under which peaceful relations may be carried on between the two systems despite their unlikeness.

Two years ago, our Government finally began to recognize that we cannot buy Russia's coöperation by sacrificing our principles and other people's rights and territory. Step by step, we have embarked on a five-point program which I believe is sound and has some promise of success if firmly and patiently continued and expanded.

First, rebuilding enough of our scrapped military strength to fulfill our commitments overseas and to meet any probable emergencies or dangers. Strength, here at home, is indispensable if we hope to influence the Kremlin at all.

Second, resistance to any further spread in Europe and the Near East of the glacier of tyranny moving out of the Soviet Union.

Third, assistance, on a coöperative basis, to the western European nations and Western Germany in their struggle to recover

economic stability against determined communist efforts to weaken and subjugate them.

From the beginning it was apparent that full economic recovery could not be achieved without a fourth step — a mutual defense program — the North Atlantic Pact. A sense of security is essential if the peoples of Europe are to put everything they have into the recovery effort.

The defense program and the economic program are both necessary if either is to succeed. But progress in Europe alone cannot be enough. Asia must also be free and on our side if we are to have a strongly favorable a balance of power in the world that it can perhaps influence the Soviets toward coöperation rather than conquest.

Tragically, our Government has followed opposite policies, on the opposite sides of the globe. In Europe, we follow the Truman policy of resistance to communism and assistance to freedom, and are making real headway. But in Asia, we still follow the Wallace policy of trying to appease communism, with total disaster.

By refusing to give vigorous and effective support to those who were opposing communist aggression in China, we actually intervened in favor of that aggression — the worst possible alternative. That is the measure of how immature we still are in the political and ideological fields.

That brings us to the necessary

fifth step—not just opposition to further extension of the Soviet system of compulsion, but a positive sense of mission to spread throughout the world our system based on voluntary coöperation. We must give to the world a more adequate presentation of the thrilling story of what has happened and can happen under freedom.

We must show the oppressed peoples and the undecided peoples of the world a better alternative by performance, not just promises.

The desperate measures Russia is taking to prevent the story of freedom from reaching those under her control and her own stupendous efforts in the propaganda field are the eloquent proof of how great is her faith in the power of ideas. We dare not be less effective in presenting the facts than Russia is in selling falsehoods.

All of the above are essential, but they are not enough. They merely buy time for a sixth step: give us one more chance to get the world organized on a sounder basis. We must move boldly and imaginatively to strengthen the United Nations so that it can handle effectively all threats to the peace from whatever source. If Russia will not agree to changes that would make all members subject to the same laws, and vetoes them, then we should organize on a closer basis with all the nations that will agree—not outside the United Nations, but inside it.

As long as we timidly indicate we will not do anything unless or until Russia agrees, of course she will not agree. Why should she?

We can expect the men in the Kremlin to change from obstructionism to some sort of coöperation only when we confront them with a set of circumstances where agreement is more advantageous than continued disagreement — a closed door to conquest, an open door to coöperation. To demonstrate to the Russians quickly that, if necessary, we and the other free peoples of the world can and will get along without them is, I believe, the best way to get along better with them. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Judd. Now we will hear a very familiar voice — and our television audiences may see—Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn, dean of American radio commentators, many times a globe circler, who last year went behind the iron curtain, and this year visited Europe's trouble spots, from which he's just returned. Mr. Kaltenborn, will you step up, please? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn:

What a surprise! Three Town Hall speakers who seem to agree. What a way for starting your fifteenth anniversary, George!

And it may be four speakers. This is my eighth Town Hall discussion on Russia, but it is the first time everyone seems to agree

with what I am now saying for the eighth time — that we must be strong and firm in dealing with Communists. I applaud the educational influence of Town Hall.

We worry too much about our differences with Russia. Suppose we let Russia worry a bit about her differences with us. After all we, not Russia, won the cold war in Europe, which Russia declared

We won it with the Marshall Plan. We won it with the Berlin airlift. And now we are signing the Atlantic Pact so that it stays won.

Western Germany is prospering; Eastern Germany is collapsing. Russia knows that. She called off the blockade of Berlin because of that.

Russia had a dual purpose in seeking the Paris Four-Power Conference that is now in progress.

First, Russia wants to shatter the hard-won unity of the three western powers. She still hopes to trade on differences between France, Britain, and the United States.

Second, Russia still hopes to trick us into more concessions. She fooled us at Teheran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam. She hopes to be able to fool us again in Paris. Molotov was unable to do it at the most recent Big Four meetings, but perhaps Vishinsky will succeed where Molotov failed. In any case Vishinsky knows how to browbeat those he cannot convince. Today he began to fulminate.

In Paris, western unity has been maintained. Nor were we fooled by Vishinsky's demand for a return to Potsdam. That demand was well answered by Secretary of State Acheson. He told Vishinsky, "You are asking an invalid (meaning Germany) who has retained the use of three of his limbs (the three reconstructed western zones) to go back to complete paralysis."

To assume, as tonight's questioner asks, that we can resolve all our differences with Russia is wishful thinking. We can resolve some of them. We can agree to live and let live. I agree with Mr. Magidoff and Dr. Judd that a hot war would be futile. It would settle nothing, and it would prove nothing.

The western allies are infinitely stronger in that industrial power which in the end would determine victory. We produce 13 times as much oil, 6 times as much steel. The Kremlin knows these facts. Whatever we may think about Kremlin morals, let us not underestimate Kremlin intelligence.

We can live in the same world with Russia without military war, but we must never assume that there can be any compromise between communism and democracy. Here is the difference with Russia that cannot be resolved. Communism is atheistic, intolerant, immoral, uncompromising. Democracy is theistic, tolerant, moral, and believes in reasonable compromise.

While the Kremlin functions as

the cardinals' college of communism, our fundamental difference with Russia remains. So, what to do? Here is my answer expressed in a simple three-point policy:

1. We must preserve the hard-won unity of the three western powers. Sticking together in the face of the communist menace is more important than the complete triumph of British, French, or American views on Germany's future. We are agreed that tomorrow's Germany must be peaceful, self-supporting, and democratic. We can agree on the best way to achieve these common objectives.

2. We must continue to carry out the program which has already given Germany a democratic government and a good chance to become self-supporting. There must be no attempt to appease Russia at the expense of this program. In Paris, Vishinsky has now been told we will not abandon the ripening fruits of three years of patient reconstruction.

3. We must continue to be strong, patient, and firm in holding to the policy we have proclaimed. Our armed strength must be maintained. We can afford to be patient while we lead from strength. We must be firm, because that is the way to maintain Russia's respect. Our disastrous appeasement policy only invited contempt.

If we persist in unity, if we maintain our present program, if we join patience and firmness with strength, we cannot only

keep the peace, but we can make Europe safe for the democratic way of life. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Our next speaker is also a familiar voice to Town Meeting listeners, who has not always agreed with Mr. Kaltenborn. He, too, has been a close student of international relations, particularly with regard to Germany. He gave up a successful banking career in 1935 to take up writing and public speaking. He's written many books, the latest entitled *Last Call for Common Sense*, to be published on June 16. Mr. James P. Warburg, welcome back to Town Meeting. Mr. Warburg. (Applause.)

Mr. Warburg:

As I see it, Mr. Denny, our problem is how to end the vicious circle of mutual provocation in which we are now entangled with the Soviet Union.

Our fundamental differences with Russia may or may not be reconcilable, but we all seem to agree that we do not have to resolve all our differences in order to remove the danger which now overhangs the world. What we must do is to find a way of disagreeing without letting our disagreements lead to war and the destruction of all hope of a decent future for mankind.

As yet, I think Russia and the United States do not know each other well enough to attempt re-

solving their differences with any great promise of success. Mark Twain might have put it that "at present, we each know too much about the other that ain't so."

What we can and must do is to convert the existing state of mutual distrust and fear into a state of mind in which differences are more calmly taken for granted and gradually more clearly understood. Once that is accomplished, both sides may come to realize that mutually advantageous cooperation is quite possible even without a complete reconciliation of divergent points of view.

All four of us having thus made the question somewhat easier, I must admit that it is still a difficult one to answer. How do we find a way to disagree peaceably?

I have four suggestions:

1. I think that we must recognize that there is no alternative to a peaceful solution. Nothing is more certain to destroy the free world we seek to preserve than a Third World War. We shall never find the path to peace so long as we contemplate the possibility of a solution through armed conflict.

We, here, seem to agree on this point, but too many Americans still think that, if worst comes to worst, we can defeat Russia, and thus save ourselves and western civilization. We probably can defeat Russia, but not without likewise defeating ourselves and the cause of human freedom.

2. Here I can agree completely

with Congressman Judd that we must recognize that there will be an increasing danger of war so long as the arms race continues, and that the only way to stop the arms race is to set about making the United Nations into a world organization capable of enacting and enforcing world law. This cannot be done overnight, but we can, overnight, make up our minds that this is our goal.

It goes without saying that we should encounter Soviet opposition, but in a constructive program of peacefully uniting a divided world, we should enjoy far greater and more effective support from the peoples of the world than we can ever hope to muster in the present sterile and highly dangerous power struggle.

3. We must try to shift the emphasis in our foreign policy from fear-inspired negative action to confidence-inspired positive procedure. In other words, we must try to shift our major effort from the Churchill policy, misnamed the Truman Doctrine, to our native-born Marshall Plan approach to reconstruction and rehabilitation.

At present, we are spending less than 6 billion dollars a year on our positive program for peace, and more than three times that amount to insure ourselves against its failure.

The way to stop Russia is to stop letting Russia make our foreign policy. The way to stop communism is not merely to try to con-

tain it in a physical frontier manned by physical force, but to oppose it with a courageous and imaginative American policy for the betterment of the human race.

4. I think we must be careful not to let the cold war become an end in itself. For the past six months we have been running away from a German peace settlement for fear that, by reopening our talks with Russia, we might weaken our position in the cold war.

Fortunately, it is now beginning to look as if we had come to realize that the cold war is not an end in itself, but merely a means of attaining, through a display of strength tempered by wisdom, a just and lasting peace.

To sum up, our primary job is not to worry about the intentions of the fourteen men in the Kremlin. Our primary job is to infuse with new life and vigor the hopes and aspirations we share with the masses of mankind. The mission of America has never been, and is not now, to defend an existing order, but to lead forward through peaceful change toward a future fit for man. If we fulfill that mission, we can let Russia do the worrying about reconciling her differences with a free world. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Warburg. Well, gentlemen, there seems to be a great deal of agreement among the four of you here tonight. I suppose

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

HANS V. KALTENBORN — Dean of American radio commentators, H. V. Kaltenborn made his first news broadcast in 1922. Born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Mr. Kaltenborn was graduated from Harvard in 1909 with an A.B. cum laude. Since then, he has received several honorary degrees. For twenty years, 1910-1930, he was associated with the *Brooklyn Eagle*. In 1930, he left the *Eagle* for WABC, key station for Columbia network. Since 1940, he has been with the National Broadcasting Company. Mr. Kaltenborn has been radio reporter for many political conventions, League of Nations sessions, Pan American Peace Conferences, and the like. His honors and citations for meritorious radio reporting are numerous. Mr. Kaltenborn is the author of several books and many magazine articles. Among his books are *We Look at the World*, *Kaltenborn Edits the News* and *I Broadcast the Crisis*. Mr. Kaltenborn traveled behind the Iron Curtain in 1948 and returned from Germany in April, 1949.

JAMES P. WARBURG — Born in Hamburg, Germany, in 1896, James Warburg was brought to the United States in infancy. A graduate of Harvard, he has been connected with various banks since 1919. He is now president and a director of the Bank of Manhattan. He is also a director of several railway companies and of the Polaroid Corporation.

During the war, Mr. Warburg was a special assistant to the coordinator of information and from 1942 to 1944, he was deputy director of the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information, stationed in London and Wash-

ington. During World War I, he served in the U. S. Navy and in the Navy Flying Corps.

Mr. Warburg was a financial adviser for the World Economic Conference in London in 1933. He is the author of many books including *Last Call for Common Sense*.

WALTER H. JUDD — Walter Judd, Republican Congressman from Minnesota, was a medical missionary and hospital superintendent in China for a number of years (1925-31 and 1934-38), under the auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. He was born in Rising Sun, Nebraska, and received his B.A. and M.D. degrees from the University of Nebraska. In 1918 he enlisted in the United States Army and served in the Field Artillery.

In 1923 he received his medical degree and not long after went to China. During a furlough in the United States he had a fellowship in surgery at the Mayo Foundation in Rochester, Minnesota (1932-34). Dr. Judd spent 1939 and 1940 speaking throughout the United States in an attempt to arouse Americans to the menace of Japan's military expansion and to get an embargo established on the sale and shipment of war materials to Japan. At the time of his election to Congress, Dr. Judd was conducting a private medical practice in Minneapolis. He is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

ROBERT MAGIDOFF — Mr. Magidoff was formerly a radio commentator and Associated Press correspondent in Moscow. He was expelled from Russia in the spring of 1943. He is the author of *In Anger and Pity*.

we ought to have had a representative of Mr. Henry Wallace on the platform.

Mr. Kaltenborn, are you going to let Mr. Warburg get away with all that, or are you going to ask him a question or two? I think we ought to have a few questions among the speakers before we take the questions from this eager Town Hall anniversary audience. Mr. Kaltenborn?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Obviously, Mr.

Warburg is much more idealistic than I am in his whole approach to the problem. I like idealism, but I find that it leads us down devious paths and persuades us to make many mistakes. We tried idealism in our relations with the Soviet Union, and you know where we got. You know what happened as the result of the many concessions that we have made.

I should like to ask Mr. Warburg what is there in the Soviet Union

of today that leads him to be more optimistic about the idealistic approach than he would have been a few years ago? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Warburg: Well, Mr. Kaltenborn, in the first place, I don't think to be called an idealist is an insult. (*Applause.*)

In the second place, I don't think that I was expressing any particular idealism about the Soviet Union. What I was, perhaps, expressing was a point of view which rather suggests that we forget about the Soviet Union and be a little idealistic about ourselves. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, I just want to put one concrete question there. You suggested that the six billion dollars that we're spending on the Marshall Plan, as compared with the fifteen billion dollars that we're spending on armaments, should perhaps be reversed. That's the suggestion that I caught; that may be incorrect. But do you think that we're actually spending too much for armaments, in view of the state of the world at the present time?

Mr. Warburg: My answer to that is that in the first place I did not suggest that we reverse the exact figures. I didn't say we should spend three times as much on the Marshall Plan as we spend on armaments. I said we should try to shift the emphasis. Shifting the emphasis might mean spending about the same amount on each.

What I am convinced of is that there is absolutely no point in pre-

serving military power in the world, as it is today, except for one purpose, and that is to deter aggression.

Now the minute you go beyond that, and preserve military power because you want to prepare yourself to win the war, if a war comes, then you are doing something quite different. What you are then doing is to provoke the very war you seek to prevent. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn: I'd just like to ask Congressman Judd, as a Congressman, as one who has to vote on these things, do you think that fifteen billions is too much to spend for armament in present-day conditions?

Congressman Judd: I would answer no if I were sure that it would all be spent well. (*Laughter and applause.*) I think we are faced with a concrete situation where we'll fail if we try to do only the economic, and we'll fail if we try to just hold to a military program without putting a better alternative in its place.

It seems to me we've got to exercise a most careful and nice judgment to keep a program going that keeps us strong without breaking us, and, at the same time, not being so concerned about the domestic drain upon ourselves, in this immediate crisis, that we fail to keep strong.

It seems to me the best way we can help America to the point where we can cut down reductions for both European economic aid and military preparedness is by

making both programs succeed.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Well, you gentlemen have gone back to last week's program and before you go back another week, I'm going to take questions from the audience. Now, we have a brief message in the meantime from our announcer.

Announcer: Yes, friends, this is a real occasion—the 562d broadcast of America's Town Meeting, beginning its fifteenth year on the air. We are discussing the subject, "How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Russia?" Would you like a copy of tonight's Town Meeting, complete with questions and answers to follow? If you would, then send 10c to Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, and ask for the TOWN MEETING BULLETIN. Please do not send stamps, and allow about two weeks for delivery.

As Mr. Denny has suggested, our aim in taking your Town Meeting around the world this summer is to help you to help this country find the right answers to tonight's urgent question.

More than 13,000 Town Meeting fans have contributed more than

\$32,000 toward the expenses of this trip. Approximately \$60,000 is needed. If you haven't made your contribution yet, won't you do so just as soon as this program is over or the first thing in the morning?

Many outstanding American leaders have urged you to support this venture in democracy with your dollars. Now just before we take the questions from our audience here in Town Hall tonight, here is a message from another outstanding American to each of you. Listen!

Miss Hurst: This is Fannie Hurst speaking. This summer, a distinguished group of leaders from every walk of American life will demonstrate our American way of free discussion. They will visit a dozen world capitals from London to Tokyo on a 'Round the World Tour of "America's Town Meeting of the Air." You can assist in this stirring Dollars for Democracy mission in behalf of world peace by sending your dollar to Town Hall, New York.

Announcer: Now for our question period, we return you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now, we're ready for the questions from our audience. Will you raise your hands and indicate to me the name of the person to whom your question is directed by the number of

fingers you hold up? Yes, the gentleman over there in the white coat.

Man: My question is to Congressman Judd. Russia was earmarked for a loan of from one bil-

lion to six billion dollars. In view of her recent willingness to negotiate, do you believe that loan should be granted if it is again requested by Russia?

Congressman Judd: Not unless it is accompanied by iron-clad guarantees as to what the money is to be used for and that Russia will keep her part of whatever bargain is involved in the agreement. It seems to me that we cannot go ahead and make new agreements with a government which is in the process of breaking the agreements we made yesterday. Unless Russia is willing to do something about the situation in Poland and these other countries where she promised genuinely free and open elections — where the people could have a chance to choose the government that they themselves wanted — until she keeps her part of the bargain, I think it's nothing short of madness and quixotic for us to go ahead and build up that which is doing its level best to pull us down.

If a request comes from her for this sort of loan at this time, it will be merely a change in tactics and tune, not a change in basic objectives. Whenever her words back up her deeds, then and then only are we justified in making such a loan. At this point, I think we should, if it comes. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman in the aisle here.

Man: Mr. Warburg. Do you think that an agreement is pos-

sible in the near future on a peace treaty with Germany and, if so, under what terms?

Mr. Denny: Well, that's quite an order, Mr. Warburg.

Mr. Warburg: I don't think an agreement is possible on a peace treaty with Germany. You can't make a treaty until there is a government that you can make it with. I don't think anybody would want to make a treaty with a German government that hadn't first demonstrated that it was a regenerate and decent government.

I do think it is quite possible to reach some kind of a preliminary understanding with the Russians at the present time, which will eventually lead to something which might lead to a peace treaty. In other words, I think we can reach an economic agreement, today, although not a political one. (*Applause.*)

Man: Congressman Judd. Don't the Iron Curtain and universal Fifth Columnists indicate an uncompromising determination of Russia to govern the world, making it impossible to reconcile our differences?

Congressman Judd: The first part of your question, I agree with. It does indicate an unwavering and iron-clad determination to conquer the world. But I don't believe that, in itself, makes impossible the development of some sort of an agreement, if, as I say, we can get a set of circumstances where it would be more dangerous

for her not to agree than to agree.

There isn't any question, in my judgment, that there cannot be peace in our time, and no relaxation for the free peoples of the world until the tyranny that's in the Kremlin is overthrown.

It can be overthrown from the outside and, as every speaker has said, it would be disastrous for us, as well as them. The only way it can be overthrown to give peace and relaxation and order and security to the world is to have it overthrown from the inside. That can't be done until we present so positive and attractive a program to the people of the world that when some changes come in the Kremlin there will be internal dissension in order to hold their own people.

We've got to hold here while building up the counter-fire, the backfire, until such time as there will be changes within the Kremlin.

At the moment, there is no possibility of agreement on ultimate objectives. I believe there can be agreement as to the immediate means by which we are to carry on relations between these two worlds; although I admit it's pretty hard to get agreement between healthy tissue and cancer that spends its time encroaching on tissues that don't belong to it.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman in the balcony.

Man: Mr. Kaltenborn. If Russia calls off the cold war, how can we be sure she is sincere?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, obviously she will not call off the cold war, because she does not admit that she has declared it. Russia does not consider that she has anything to do with the cold war. The cold war is entirely carried on by the wicked capitalist bourgeois western powers, and poor, popularly minded Russia is only defending herself against that vicious attack. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you.

Man: Mr. Warburg. I'd like to ask you this question. Why does not the U. N. guarantee the freedoms and sovereignty of its members, thereby eliminating the competition of the irreconcilable political ideologies between Russia and the democracies?

Mr. Warburg: Well, I'm afraid, sir, that question isn't quite clear to me. The U. N., if I understand you correctly, hasn't the power to do what you're suggesting. In other words, the U. N. can't guarantee, because it isn't in a position where it can make or enforce law.

Man: May I go further? It seems to me that all the troubles of the U. N. stem from the fact that they have not made the members of the U. N. safe. They're not guaranteed any freedoms and, because of this lack of guarantee, they have thrown the U. N. into a debating society. Especially as the U. N. is ruled by majority vote, the two conflicting and irreconcilable ideologies are now having a tremendous battle for the control of the U. N.

Mr. Warburg: I see that I did not understand your question. I think what you're asking is — you're blaming a horse for not being able to give milk. (*Laughter.*) The trouble with the U. N. is that it is not an organization capable of enacting, administering, and enforcing world law. It is nothing but a multilateral treaty between sovereign-nation states, good only so long as there is unanimous agreement among the majority of the great nations, and that is the trouble with it. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Warburg, Congressman Judd just whispered over there that to the colt, the horse does give milk. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Warburg: Wait a minute. I said horse, not mare. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: I see Mr. Magidoff sitting quietly back there and I'm going to hand him this telegram that came in this afternoon from Chestnut Hill, Pennsylvania. Mr. Magidoff, will you come over here and tackle this one?

This is from Lucy R. Jackson of Chestnut Hill: "Please try to have your speakers tonight explain fully, for the benefit of the large listening public, the difference between the conditions of workers under communism as practiced by the Soviet Union and those of workers under a democracy."

Mr. Magidoff: I shall conduct now what should be a seven-day seminar in exactly one minute and ten seconds. (*Laughter.*)

I shall start with a rather humble example. If any one of you would imagine that he and his family of four would live in one room, and would share the apartment of four more rooms with four more families averaging about three or four, having one bathroom and one kitchen, you will have a more or less correct conception of the living standards in Russia.

If you realize that, even in Moscow, which is the show place of the Soviet Union, over three-quarters of the population have no gas in their homes, and even fewer people have hot running water—over half have no running water in the house—you will have an idea of the living standards.

But what is to me more appalling than these abominably low living conditions—we can explain them away with the war and the civil war and all sorts of things—is the fact that the Soviet workers have no way of fighting for better living conditions. They have tens of millions of them organized in trade unions which have no right to call a strike. They have a 48-hour work week. The trade unions are now considered in the Soviet Union—the workers' paradise—a school for communism, and a propaganda organ, rather than an organ that is supposed to fight for bettering living conditions. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. Mr. Magidoff, I take it that you expect the listeners them-

selves to describe, in their own minds, the conditions of workers in this democracy. Thank you very much. All right, the gentleman in front.

Man: Mr. Kaltenborn, isn't the Atlantic Pact a call to war against Russia? (*Shouts of "No."*)

Mr. Denny: Yes, we'll let Mr. Kaltenborn answer that, if you don't mind.

Mr. Kaltenborn: I'm delighted to get such apparently unanimous support from the audience for my answer, for, of course, the Atlantic Pact is a pact of peace. It is a pact which unites the nations bordering on the Atlantic in the determination to prevent aggressive war. And, in union, there lies strength. The only kind of war against which the Atlantic Pact is directed is aggressive war from any source whatever. These nations pledge themselves to unite their strength against anyone guilty of such aggressive war. It is merely coöperating with the general purpose of the United Nations. But since Russia has prevented the United Nations from acquiring even a police force—and that has a good deal to do with the answer that Mr. Warburg gave to the gentleman's question—that is why the United Nations is so weak. Its purpose cannot be carried out—that of acquiring a force—because of Russia's opposition, and that is the reason for the creation of the Atlantic Pact, which at least has the military forces of the nations that

subscribe to it. But it is definitely a pact of peace. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Congressman Judd has a comment on that question.

Congressman Judd: I think it ought to be added that the way in which the formation of this pact was handled could understandably give the Russians some concern. I believe it will have success only if we succeed in making clear that it is purely defensive. Even before it was organized in the Brussels Pact, and we had some strength in Western Europe, we asked Norway to come in, for example, and put her on the spot, moved right up against the Russian border. We were in danger of provoking the very thing we were trying to avoid, because I think we must remember these men in the Kremlin have at least three rules:

First, they're Russian and they have the historic fear of the outside.

Second, they're communist; they're indoctrinated with the beliefs that the capitalist world must, by its very nature, try to encircle and destroy them.

Third, they're despots, and, like all despots, uneasy.

Now you take people with that general temperament and move right up to their border, and you can understand how they might be concerned. It seems to me it was extremely unwise of us to push so fast. We should move up to Russia's border only when we were

strong in Western Europe and had made it clear that it was purely defensive.

There's a further thing that I feel was a mistake, and weakened the Atlantic Pact. That was the language in the preamble which starts out, in the second clause, as I recall, "the signatory powers are determined to defend or protect their common heritage and civilization." Now that's true, but I think it was unwise to put it in language, because what did it do? It said, "Oh, we of the nice little select club who have the common heritage and civilization, we're getting together."

What does that say to the people who don't have the same heritage—all of South America, all of the Mohammedan world, all of Asia? It puts them on the outside; they've got to have a leader. Who's the leader of the world outside the club? The Soviet Union.

It runs the danger of driving them right into the arms of people we're trying to keep them out of. That was bad handling, but it wasn't a defect in the basic concept. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Warburg has a comment.

Mr. Warburg: As long as we are all commenting on the Atlantic Pact, I disagree with the questioner that this was an invitation to war with the Soviet Union. But I agree with Congressman Judd. I'd like to add to the last thing he said, that this whole business of clothing a necessarily cynical mili-

tary act in phony moral garments by including a country like Portugal and saying that we have a common heritage is a sheer mockery. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Kaltenborn is back on his feet again.

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, I quite agree with Congressman Judd that it may have been less than diplomatic to have included the particular phrases about the common heritage and civilization. I don't think that's an essential part of the Pact—it might well have been left out.

I disagree with him completely when he asks us to appease Russia by not giving Norway, under direct Russian threat, an opportunity to join with the Atlantic nations in protecting herself against that threat. (Applause.)

Norway showed great courage in coöperating with the western powers in the Atlantic Pact. Don't forget that Russia had threatened her with regard to Spitzbergen, that Russia had threatened her with direct notes, cautioning her not to enter the Atlantic Pact. If she had not done so, that would have been appeasement in its worst sense, and she would have suffered for it. It is because she had the courage of her convictions and joined with the nations of the Atlantic in this common defense that she is safe. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Congressman Judd again. Yes?

Congressman Judd: It so happens that I represent, in Congress,

the city of Minneapolis, which, next to Oslo, is the biggest Norwegian city in the world. (*Laughter.*) I think I know something of the reaction of the Norwegians. It's perfectly true that after we invited Norway in and put her in a position where she had to make this difficult decision, not from the inside of her heart, but from the technical standpoint, they had no choice except to come along and they showed great courage.

But it was only after we invited them to come in that these threats came from Russia. That was the point I was making. Russia didn't give the warning that she mustn't come in until after we had invited her in.

It seems to me we should have led from strength when we got strong in Western Europe, not lead from weakness. I take off my hat to the Norwegians who put their chips on our side when it really cost them something. Their neck's up against the buzz saw, but we shouldn't have put it up against the buzz saw. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. Mr. Kaltenborn?

Mr. Kaltenborn: I think one reason why Norway was perfectly willing to come along with us and why it was not because we had put her on the spot—she had plenty of opportunities to do exactly what Sweden did—was that she knew what Russia was trying to do. The Spitzbergen campaign that Russia carried out, and in which we helped her and Britain

helped her to defend herself against allowing Russia to come into Spitzbergen, that came long before the Atlantic Pact was even discussed. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Well, make it brief, Mr. Warburg. I want to get a question here.

Mr. Warburg: I just want to come to the assistance of the Congressman, although he doesn't need it. I think there's a very great similarity between this terrific attack on Spitzbergen by the Russians and our equally terrific attack on Denmark for Greenland and Iceland. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. Now let's take a question from the lady down there.

Lady: Mr. Magidoff. Do you believe that intervention in China on the side of Chiang Kai-shek would have furthered the cause of democracy and also aided the Chinese people to a better life?

Mr. Magidoff: I didn't quite understand the question.

Mr. Denny: Do you think that intervention on our part on the side of Chiang Kai-shek—before—would have helped the Chinese people and would have helped us?

Mr. Magidoff: Oh, I see. I'm grateful for this question, because I was going to address a question to Congressman Judd, because the Congressman said that we were firm in Europe, whereas we appeased communism in Asia. I'm afraid that we appeased reaction in Asia. We gave support and help to Chiang Kai-shek without com-

detely insisting on reforms, on clearance of corruption, and we hereby appeased reaction and not communism.

I feel that we had every right to help Chiang Kai-shek against the Communists provided we also used our good money and good arms and our entire prestige in order to clear China of corruption. Democracy hasn't done the job and so the Communists are doing it. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Magidoff. I'm sure that calls for Congressman Judd.

Congressman Judd: The program of assistance we gave in China never was the sort that could succeed. Nobody opposed it and criticized it more bitterly than I did. There was no possibility of solving the situation in China with just our usual American arms and money.

The thing that the Chinese needed above all things else was moral support. They had stood by us when our fleet lay at the bottom of the sea. They had allowed the Communists to expand. They had assumed that we would stand by them with help and encouragement, and technical and personal assistance in their dark hour after the war.

When the war was over, instead of going in and helping and encouraging them, as we are doing with the European countries, we went in and sat up in the grandstand, and issued orders down to them on the playing field, broken,

on-the-ropes, exhausted in the midst of inflation, and with the corruption which is age-long in China, and which grows up in any country in the world, including the best democracy in a period of uncontrolled inflation.

Our job wasn't to give moral lectures; our job was to give support, not approval—support of the effort to remain free. If the Chinese are free, the reforms that you and I want will be obtained by them. But if they're under Soviet Union, the reforms you and I and our country wanted are no more possible than they are today in Poland.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Judd. You see we inevitably get into these different areas of conflict when we discuss the tensions between Soviet Russia and ourselves. That points up the importance of our Town Meeting World Tour. Now while our speakers prepare their summaries, here's a special message of interest to you.

Announcer: When your Town Meeting goes around the world this summer, it will be accompanied by twenty-five leaders of representative national organizations with a combined membership of more than fifty million Americans. We have told you about most of them; leaders in the fields of business, labor, agriculture, education, veterans' groups, women's organizations, fraternal, and service organizations.

Recent additions to the World

Town Hall Seminar are three American businessmen, Mr. William C. Denison, Jr., president of the Denison Engineering Co.; Mr. Peter Grimm, former president of the N. Y. State Chamber of Commerce and chairman of the board of Town Hall; and Mr. Robert Byfield, member of the New York Stock Exchange; also, Mrs. Grace Hare Frye, director of the Columbus, Ohio, Town Meeting; and Roger Kvam, representing American high school youth.

These leaders or their organizations are paying their own expenses. Your Dollars for Democracy contributions are being used for expenses of the Town Hall staff and extra promotion and publicity.

Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Here first is Mr. James P. Warburg. Mr. Warburg.

Mr. Warburg: The four of us seem to agree that the problem is to buy time. Our opinions seem to vary as to how to buy it, and what to do with it when we've bought it. Mr. Judd and I agree that world government is essential to lasting peace. We would make this an avowed aim of American policy.

My realistic friend, Mr. Kaltenborn, I think, tends to see the power struggle too much in delightfully simple terms of good and evil. Now I admit it is hard to see much good in Soviet Communism. But the danger in seeing

Russia as wholly black is that it leads us to regard ourselves as wholly white, and once we do that, we shall have lost our magic.

What we need to do is to reread our own Declaration of Independence and rededicate ourselves to its fulfillment. Then we shall stop Russia as the by-product of a constructive American policy of peace.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Warburg. Now Mr. Kaltenborn.

Mr. Kaltenborn: No, Russia is not wholly black and America is not wholly white, but Russia is communistic and America is democratic, and that's enough difference for me.

We have agreed on the fundamentals of American policy towards Russia. That means we have a policy now which appeals to the largest cross section of American public opinion. It appeals to us because it's sound, because it's fair and firm, and because it is succeeding. We can best reconcile our differences with Russia by continuing what we are doing now.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Now Congressman Judd.

Congressman Judd: Our hopes for the future, as I see it, lie in mobilizing to the utmost our strength and skill in the political and ideological fields as well as the economic and military. I believe that we can win through to freedom and peace if we, ourselves, and the other free peoples,

believe so intensely in the system of government by voluntary federation which our forefathers established here that we can outthink and outwork and outsacrifice and outlast any other people in the world.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Judd. And now, Mr. Magidoff.

Mr. Magidoff: The lack of basic agreement among the four of us despite the striking differences in our backgrounds and points of view on many other subjects is a significant illustration of the unity of this country toward Russia as it is today.

We agree that war is no solution and must be avoided, and we see the necessity and possibility of fighting for democracy rather than against communism or Russia.

It is, therefore, good advice that two of our speakers tonight, Mr. Altendorf and Mr. Warburg, have given us, in the full knowledge of our strength, to worry less about what Russia is going to do and to concentrate with greater energy on our main job — the strengthening of democracy at home and abroad. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Magidoff. We must not close tonight's anniversary meeting without a word of appreciation to Mrs. Elizabeth Colclough, our program

director; Mrs. Marian Carter, her associate; Mr. William Traum, our business manager; and their capable and efficient staff here at Town Hall; and to Mr. Robert Saudek, vice president of the American Broadcasting Company and all of his associates in production, programming, engineering, and publicity for their able assistance throughout our past year, our fourteenth on the air.

This marked Town Meeting's debut as a regular television feature this year, and I am sure that you television viewers join with me in expressing appreciation and thanks to Marshall Diskin and his staff who bring you the Town Meetings on television.

Let me express my personal thanks also to the managers and staffs of the 265 stations which bring you Town Meeting by radio each week.

Next week, we'll journey to near-by Bound Brook, New Jersey, for a discussion of the question, "What Should Be the Limits for Public Free Speech?" Our speakers will be Norman Thomas; the Reverend G. Bromley Oxnam; Bartley Crum, the former publisher of the *New York Star*; and a fourth speaker to be announced.

Be with us next week and every week at the sound of the crier's bell.



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 14

16. What Should We Do in the Berlin Situation?
17. Should College Football Be Subsidized?
18. Is Our Present Foreign Policy Leading to Peace or War?
19. Is the Church Failing Our Youth?
20. Are the Congressional Spy Investigations Serving the National Interest?
21. What Hope for Man?
22. How Can Schools and Colleges Teach Controversial Issues?
24. How Is Peace With Russia Possible?
25. How Will Television Affect Motion Pictures?
26. What Should the United Nations Do About Palestine?
27. What Hope for Europe Now?
28. What Should We Do About Race Segregation?
29. What Should the Administration Do About the High Cost of Living?
30. Should There Be Stricter Government Control of Lobbies?
31. Are Our Ideals Being Destroyed by the Machine Age?
33. What Does the Crisis in China Mean to Us?
35. Is Labor Entitled to Another Wage Increase?
36. Are Corporate Profits Too High?
37. What's Behind the Crisis in Indonesia?
38. Can Modern Capitalism Meet the Needs of Modern Man?
39. Are We Educating for the Needs of Modern Man?
40. How Can We Make a Defense Pact With Western Europe?
41. Do We Need a New Approach to Peace?
42. Is There Any Defense Against Atomic Warfare?
43. Should We Adopt a Compulsory National Health Insurance Program?
44. Should Communists Be Allowed To Teach in Our Colleges?
45. Will a Union of the Democracies Now Promote Peace?
47. How Can We Legislate for General Welfare Without Curbing Personal Liberty?
48. What Does Democracy Really Mean?
49. Is Modern Woman Failing Her Responsibilities?
50. Is the State of the Union Still Good?
51. Should the Senate Ratify the North Atlantic Pact?
52. How Can We Find Personal Peace and Security in Today's World?

VOLUME 15

1. Should We Help To Rearm Western Europe?
2. Should Minority Groups Exercise Censorship Over Books and Films?
3. What Should We Do About the Communist Threat in Asia?
4. How Much Must We Spend for Real National Security?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.

Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, N. Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: _____

26 Weeks for Only

\$2.35

Single Copies 10c